

PATENT

REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are submitted in reply to the Office Action dated October 22, 2003.

By this amendment, the Applicant has amended Claims 1-2, 7-10 and 18. The Applicant has also amended the specification to correct a minor typographical error present therein and to make the specification conform to the originally filed drawings. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by such amendments.

Summary of the Examiner's Objections/Rejections

Claims 7 and 16 stand rejected for containing an informality. Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Meyer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,170,055). Claims 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer, et al. in view of Welder (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,179).

Objection to Claims 7 and 16

The Applicant traverses the objection of the aforementioned claims for the reasons set forth in greater detail below. The Examiner's attention is directed, for example, to page 8, lines 8-16 of the originally filed specification where the native mode of the removable device is discussed. Thus, support for the objected to claim language is present in the specification. Accordingly, reconsideration of the objection of Claims 7 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-18Claims 1-4 and 6-9

The Applicant traverses the rejection of the aforementioned claims for the reasons set forth in greater detail below. The claimed invention is directed to an apparatus and method for controlling a removable media device through the use, for example, of an abstraction layer that provides for the communication and control of such removable media devices independent of the underlying bus architecture. The novel method, as defined in Claim 1, includes the following limitation:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT

"...providing one or more generic abstraction layers in the system firmware that employ interrupt 13 functions to allow a program to communicate with the removable media device..."

which is not disclosed or otherwise taught or suggested by the cited reference.

Consequently, Meyer, et al. does not anticipate the invention defined in Claim 1 as submitted by the Examiner.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner states on page 2, paragraph 5 of the instant Office Action that:

"...Meyer et al. teaches a method for controlling a removable media device coupled to a computer system by way of a bus interface, the computer system having system firmware, the method comprising the step of:

providing one or more abstraction layers in the system firmware that employ Interrupt 13 functions to allow a program to communicate with the removable media device..."

and cites col. 9, lines 4-29 to support his assertion. However, that section of Meyer, et al. does not disclose or otherwise discuss the presence or use of a generic abstraction layer or any abstraction layer "...to allow a program to communication with the removable media device..." as defined in Claim 1.

As understood and disclosed, for example, on col. 9, lines 30-59 and col. 14, lines 37-42, Meyer, et al. discloses implementations where removable media devices are controlled by a corresponding dedicated controller based on the specific bus architecture being used (see col. 9, lines 32-35: "...the high capacity removable disk controller 27 may comprise a Small Computer System Interface (SCSI) or Integrated Drive Electronics (IDE) interface controller..."). As such, the ability to communicate with and control disparate removable media devices through a single, and possibly non-dedicated, bus architecture using a generic abstraction layer is not disclosed or even contemplated by Meyer, et al. Consequently, Meyer, et al. does not anticipate the invention as defined in Claim 1.

Additionally, the Examiner has not pointed to what portion of col. 9, lines 4-29 discloses the rejected limitation as required by 35 U.S.C. §102. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the rejection of Claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT

Given the inappropriateness of the rejection and that the cited reference neither discloses nor teaches or suggests the claimed invention, the Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9 directly or indirectly depend upon and include all the limitations of Claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Moreover, these claims define subject matter that is independently allowable over the art of record. For example, Claims 2 and 7-8 further recite and define additional characteristics of the generic abstraction layer according to the present invention. As discussed in greater detail above, the presence or use of an abstraction layer is not present in Meyer, et al. Therefore, Meyer, et al. does not anticipate the invention as defined in the aforementioned claims. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6-9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-13 and 15-18

The inappropriateness of the anticipation rejection as discussed above with respect to Claim 1 is equally applicable to the rejection of Claim 10 and is incorporated in its entirety herein.

Substantively, Claim 10 is directed to an apparatus including system firmware that "...include : one or more abstraction layers that employ interrupt 13 functions to allow a program to communicate with the removable media device..." As discussed in greater detail above with respect to Claim 1, Meyer, et al. does not disclose or otherwise teach or suggest the presence or use of an abstraction layer that provides for communication with a removable media device. As such, the Applicant submits that Meyer, et al. also does not anticipate the invention as defined in Claim 10. Accordingly, reconsideration of rejection of Claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-18 directly or indirectly depend upon and include the limitations of Claim 10 and are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 10. Moreover, these claims define subject matter that is independently allowable over the art of record. More specifically, Claims 11 and 16-17 further define the architecture and functionality of the abstraction layer which, as discussed above, is not disclosed or

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT

otherwise taught or suggested in Meyer, et al. Consequently, at least the aforementioned claims are allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 10-13 and 15-18 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 5 and 14

The Applicant traverses the rejection of the aforementioned claims for the reasons set forth in greater detail below. Claim 5 depends upon and includes all the limitations of Claim 1 and is submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1 as combining Welder with Meyer, et al. still does not overcome the aforementioned shortcomings of Meyer, et al. Claim 14 depends upon and includes all the limitations of Claim 10 and is submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 10 as combining Welder with Meyer, et al. still does not overcome the aforementioned shortcomings of Meyer, et al. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 5 and 14 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-18 are now in proper condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayments or credit any over payments to Deposit Account No. 16-1520 for any payment in connection with this communication, including any fees for extension of time, which may be required. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if such action might expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
PHOENIX TECHNOLOGIES LTD.

Date: 4/22/04

By: 

Loren H. McRoss
Registration No. 40,427

915 Murphy Ranch Road
Milpitas, CA 95035
PH: (408) 570-1000
FX: (408) 570-1044

BEST AVAILABLE COPY